

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 18, 36-41, 43-48, 58-62, and 68-83 are pending in the application, with 1, 18, 58, 68, 76, and 83 being the independent claims

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 68, arguing that U.S. Patent 4,802,119 ("HEENE") discloses comparing, in parallel, an address to boundary addresses stored in a plurality of boundary address registers. HEENE, however, fails to disclose the comparing of addresses. Rather, HEENE teaches the comparison of the eight most significant bits of an address with eight bits of another address. Therefore, addresses are not being compared in HEENE, only segments thereof-- only the eight leading bits of addresses are compared. (HEENE, column 7, lines 16-32). Moreover, the data comparators of Figure 4 of HEENE are in fact eight bit comparators. (HEENE, column 7, line 16, and Figure 4). HEENE therefore fails to teach the claimed comparison, in parallel, of an address to boundary addresses. Nor is this feature taught or suggested by the other reference cited by the Examiner, U.S. Patent 5,115,500 ("LARSEN"). Because this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, claim 68 is not obvious over this art.

The Examiner further rejects claims 69-75. The rejection of these claims is premised on the Examiner's above argument regarding claim 68. All of claims 69-75 necessarily include the feature of comparing, in parallel, an address to boundary addresses. As discussed above, this feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Claims 69-75 are therefore not rendered obvious over this art.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 76, arguing that HEENE discloses the comparison, in parallel, of an address to boundary addresses. As discussed above, HEENE does not teach this feature. Rather, HEENE at best teaches the comparison of partial addresses. HEENE fails to teach or suggest the feature of comparing, in parallel, an address to boundary addresses. Nor does LARSEN teach or suggest this feature.

Claim 76 is therefore not obvious in view of the cited art.

The rejection of claims 77-82 is premised on the Examiner's above argument regarding claim 76. All of claims 77-82 necessarily include the feature of comparing, in parallel, an address to boundary addresses. As discussed above, this feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Claims 77-82 are therefore not rendered obvious over this art.

The Examiner also argues that claim 83 is obvious, given the teaching of HEENE. The Examiner again argues that HEENE teaches the comparing, in parallel, of a memory address with another memory address. As discussed above, neither HEENE nor LARSEN teaches or suggests this feature. Claim 83 is therefore not rendered obvious over this reference.

Other Matters

The Examiner states that claims 1, 9, 18, 36-41, 43-48, and 58-62 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his consideration of these claims.

The Examiner has also pointed out that the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 22, 2005 fails to fully comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(b)(4). Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out that Europe is in fact a continent and not a country, and that documents originating from the European Patent Office should be designated "EPO" rather than simply "Europe". Applicants note that the Examiner has nonetheless considered the references identified in this Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants thank the Examiner for considering these references.

The Examiner also appears to make a double patenting rejection of the pending claims of this application, in view of co-pending application 09/702,115. In light of this double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer is filed herewith.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Edward W. Yee
Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: FEB. 21, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

iM # 493274